REMARKS

ON THE

FOURTEENTH SECTION

OF

Dr. PRIESTLEY's DISQUISITIONS

ON

MATTER AND SPIRIT.

By RICHARD ORMEROD, A. B.
OF CHRIST COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

"The Writers of the Scriptures were not Philosophers, but had an instruction infinitely superior to that of any philosophical School."

Dr. Priestley's Disq. on Matter and Spirit, p. 149.

Jacet enim corpus dormientis, ut mortui; viget autem, et vivit *animus*; quod multo magis faciet, quum omnino corpore excesserit.

Cic. de Divin.

CAMBRIDGE,

Printed by J. ARCHDEACON Printer to the UNIVERSITY;

For J. & J. MERRILL, in Cambridge; J. ROBSON, in New Bond Street, T. CADELL, in the Strand, B WHITE & Son, in Fleet-street, G. & T. WILKIE, in St. Paul's Churchyard, and J. DEIGHTON, No. 274, Holborn, London.

MDCCLXXXVI.

INTRODUCTION.

AS moſt of the other parts of the Diſquiſitions on Matter and Spirit have occaſionally been animadverted upon by authors of reputation, it might naturally have been expected that ſome perſon, diſtinguiſhed in the literary world, would have taken the 14th ſection alſo into conſideration; eſpecially as the hypotheſis, which Dr. Prieſtley attempts to ſupport, muſt neceſſarily give way, if his arguments

guments in that ſection ſhould appear to be ill-founded.

As no one, however, has, I believe, profeſſedly engaged in this part of the work, the following pages have been drawn up, with a deſign to ſhew what ſtreſs is to be laid on the texts, produced from Scripture, in ſupport of his opinion.

For, had it remained unanſwered, Dr. Prieſtley might probably have concluded, that the public acquieſced in his interpretation.

REMARKS, &c.

IN the introduction to his Disquisition on Matter and Spirit, Dr. Priestley informs us *, that "the principal object of "that work is to prove the uniform com-"position of man, or, that what we call "*mind*, or the principle of perception and "thought is not a substance distinct from "the body, but the result of corporeal or-"ganization."

In

* Page 4th.

In the 14th ſection of this work, he profeſſes to give "the principles of *human* "*nature* according to the ſcriptures."

In the beginning of which, he aſſerts, that "nothing can be found in the ſacred "books to countenance the vulgar opinion, "except a few paſſages ill tranſlated, or ill "underſtood, ſtanding in manifeſt contra-"diction to the uniform tenor of the reſt."

That Dr. Prieſtley has here aſſerted much more than he has proved, will, it is apprehended, evidently appear from an examination of the texts of ſcripture, which he has produced, together with the arguments he has uſed to ſupport his favourite doctrine. Of ſome texts, he has plainly given a wrong interpretation; in reaſoning upon others, he has drawn concluſions, which certainly do not neceſſarily ariſe from the premiſes; and, in ſeveral inſtances, even where his deductions are juſt, the doctrine, which he is en-

endeavouring to ſubvert, is not affected by them.

Theſe ſeveral charges are intended to be ſupported in the courſe of the following remarks.

The text, which Dr. Prieſtley firſt produces, is Gen. ii. 7. concerning the formation of man.

Page 154. " The hiſtory of the creation " of man," ſays he, " is ſuccinctly delivered " in Gen. ii. 7. *And the Lord God formed* " *man of the duſt of the ground, and breathed* " *into his noſtrils the breath of life, and man* " *became a living ſoul.* We ſee here that the " *whole man* was made of the duſt of the " ground. No part of him is ſaid to have " had a higher, or different original. It is " not ſaid that when one conſtituent part " of the man was made, another neceſſary " conſtituent part of a very different nature " was ſuperadded to it; and, that theſe two, " united, conſtituted the man."

"We ſee here that the *whole man* was made of the duſt of the ground. No part of him is ſaid to have had a higher or different original." &c. &c.

It ſeems as if the contrary of what Dr. Prieſtley aſſerts, might fairly be deduced from the words before us. It does not appear that the *whole man* is ſaid to be formed of the duſt of the ground, but only a *part*, a mere *organized body*, which was not complete, till God breathed into it the breath of life. This ſenſe of the text will be farther confirmed from conſidering Gen. i. 27.

"*God created man in his own image*," &c.

Can *this image conſiſt in the earthy part of man**? How comes it, that man bears *any reſemblance* to God? Is it from his being formed of the duſt of the ground? Or, is it not rather by means of another act of divine power expreſſed in the words, *he breathed*

* John iv. 24. Luke xxiv. 39.

breathed into him the breath of life, which clearly intimates man's peculiar relation to his Maker, who imparted to him ſome kindred principle, not taken from the duſt of the ground? In the hiſtory here given us of man's formation, though ſo ſhort and conciſe, we not only learn that man is compoſed of two conſtituent parts, but we alſo ſee the diſtinct original aſſigned to each.

It is ſaid firſt — that *the Lord God formed man of the duſt of the ground:* and then it is ſaid — that *he breathed into his noſtrils the breath of life.* It is remarkable that this circumſtance is not mentioned by Moſes, when he ſpeaks of the creation of brutes: and why ſhould it be mentioned here, if no more be meant by it, than mere *animal* life? Beſides, the word נשמת here rendered breath, in Job xxxii. 8. and Prov. xx. 27. evidently denotes the intelligent, or underſtanding part of man; but mere life or breath cannot be ſuppoſed to have in-

telligence

telligence or underſtanding. Therefore, we may conclude, that ſomething more than life or breath is here intended by the ſacred hiſtorian.

A late learned writer, well acquainted with the language of ſcripture, expreſſes himſelf in the following manner. "The "body conſiſts of a mean material, the duſt "of the ground; but the mind is of nobler "extraction, *for* (chap. ii. 7.) *God breathed* "*into his noſtrils the breath of life, and man* "*became a living ſoul. The inſpiration of the* "*Almighty giveth us underſtanding*, the no-"bleſt gift of our maker *."

Pag. 154, 155. "That no ſtreſs is to be "laid upon the word נפש, which we tranſ-"late *ſoul* (though it would be moſt of all "abſurd to ſuppoſe, as we muſt have done "from a fair conſtruction of this paſſage, "that the duſt of the earth could be con-"verted into an *immaterial ſoul*) is evident "from

* See Dr. Taylor on the Creation of Man.

" from the uſe of the ſame term, in other
" places, in which it is uſed as ſynonimous
" to *man*, the *whole man*, and, in ſome, ma-
" nifeſtly ſignifies nothing more than the
" *corporeal* or *mortal* part of man."

Dr. Prieſtley here means, if I rightly underſtand him, that no ſtreſs is to be laid upon the word נפש, becauſe it has ſeveral very different meanings: but by this method of reaſoning, he might prove that no ſtreſs is to be laid upon almoſt any word. That נפש is uſed to denote *man*, the *whole man*, the *corporeal* or *mortal part* of man, is no ſort of proof that it can never ſignify what we mean by the word *ſoul*. ψυχη, the correſponding word in Greek, and *anima*, in Latin, have almoſt as oppoſite meanings as נפש in Heb.

P. 155. " Sometimes the word that is here rendered *ſoul*, is uſed to expreſs the *dead body* itſelf, and is ſo tranſlated by us.

As

As Lev. xxi. 1. 11. *There ſhall none be defiled for the dead among his people, neither ſhall he go in to any dead body, nor defile himſelf for father, or mother.* Ib. xix. 28. *Ye ſhall not make any cuttings in your fleſh for the dead.* Numb. xix. 13. *Whoſoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead.* "In this laſt paſſage," Dr. Prieſtley obſerves, "that the periphraſis "is very remarkable, and, that if in this paſ-"ſage the word נפש ſhould be rendered "*ſoul*, it muſt be tranſlated thus, *Whoſoever* "*toucheth the dead ſoul of a man, who ſhall* "*die.*" See alſo Hag. ii. 13.

It has never, I apprehend, been ſuppoſed that the word נפש in this, and the above cited paſſages, ſignifies *ſoul*; nor is there any neceſſity for its being ſo rendered.

However, the periphraſis, which Dr. Prieſtley thinks ſo remarkable, will not be much improved, if this word ſhould be rendered *life* inſtead of *ſoul*, as he propoſes to render it in other places. For then, if the Dr. has

has tranſlated the paſſage right, it will be "*Whoſoever toucheth the* dead life *of a man who* "*ſhall die*;" now a *dead life* ſeems to be an expreſſion not much more abounding in ſenſe than a *dead ſoul*.

But perhaps it will be better not to rely too much on Dr. Prieſtley's tranſlation. For the word מת, which, in ſome places, ſignifies a dead body, he has entirely left out, as any perſon, acquainted with the original text, may eaſily perceive; and probably he had a reaſon for it. For, on the ſuppoſition that נפש here ſignifies a *dead body*, there is no neceſſity for the word מת; the ſenſe is complete without it:—and, had he taken it in, it would neceſſarily have confuſed the ſentence, which muſt then have run thus:

'*Whoſoever touches a dead body*, (במת) *a* '*dead body* (בנפש) *of a man who ſhall die*.'

Dead body would thus have been twice

expressed; for מת, at ver. 11th and 16th of this chapter, is rendered a *dead body*, and in several other places in scripture *.

But the original text has, probably, been corrupted in this place: for the construction is singular; at least, I do not recollect a similar one.

It seems probable, that the preposition ב prefixed before נפש, was mistaken by the transcribers for ל, which might easily happen. And then, it would be, (i. e. if we read ל instead of ב) *Whosoever touches the dead body of any man* (לנפש אדם) *who shall die*, similar to ver. 11th of the same chap.

I propose this, however, only as a conjecture. But it is a conjecture, which seems

* Gen. xx. 3.—2 Kings viii. 5. and for the *dead*, Deut. xiv. 1. and xxvi. 14.—2 Sam. xiv. 2.—Deut. xxv. 5. *dead husband*.—But, if it be an adjective, and signify *dead only*, in the above passage, then the epithet *dead*, according to Dr. Priestley's rendering of the word נפש, would be twice expressed,

ſeems to be countenanced by the different verſions in the Polyglott Bible. And, I find Dr. Kennicott, in his Heb. Bible, has a MS. which reads ל inſtead of ב in this place, and כל before נפש, which ſeems alſo neceſſary; for כל נפש אדם is a phraſe generally tranſlated *any man*,—See Lev. xxiv. 17.

Another of the texts above cited by Dr. Prieſtley, to prove that נפש ſignifies a *dead body*, is Lev. xxi. 11. But he happens to be unfortunate in his choice of *this* alſo; for מת (dead) is joined with it, which would be entirely uſeleſs and redundant, if this word, which we generally render *ſoul*, mean here a dead body. — And, in Lev. xxi. 1. which Dr. Prieſtley has cited for the ſame purpoſe, ܦܓܪܐ, which correſponds to מת, dead, is expreſſed in the Syriac, which ſhews that they either read from a Heb. Copy that had מת, or that they thought it neceſſary to make the ſenſe complete.

Hence it appears, that little ſtreſs can be laid upon *three* of the texts quoted by Dr. Prieſtley to ſhew that נפש ſignifies a *dead body*. The other two, viz. Lev. xix, 28. and Hag. ii. 13. appear a little more to his purpoſe; but it is probable, that מת is underſtood, both in theſe two paſſages, and, in all others, where the word נפש is thought to have this ſignification.

Some of the Commentators and Critics in the Heb. Language, have ſuppoſed that this word does ſometimes ſignify a *dead body*. But there are others of a contrary opinion. And in all the places where it occurs in this ſenſe, I can ſee no reaſon why it ſhould not be tranſlated *perſon* *, מת being underſtood.

How-

* In the following paſſage from Eurip. ψυχη ſeems to ſignify *perſon*.

Ψυχαι δε πολλαι δι' εμ' επι Σκαμανδριοις
Ροαισιν εθανον. Eurip. Helen. v. 52.

In hoc loco ψυχαι *pro Viri, et ita ſæpe* ψυχη *pro* σωμα, perſona, vir, *aut* femina. J. Barn.

However, admitting that it does ſometimes denote a dead body, the doctrine of a *ſoul*, as diſtinct from the body, is not, I apprehend, at all affected by it. All that can be fairly inferred from it, is, that the word admits very oppoſite ſenſes; and yet, not more oppoſite than thoſe, in which *anima*, the correſponding word in Latin, appears to be uſed. For, in the following paſſage of Virgil, it ſeems to ſignify a *dead body*.

——————— Animamque ſepulcro,
Condimus.———————

Æn. Lib. III. lin. 67.

And, in other places of the ſame author it denotes the *manes*, or *ſpirits*, when ſeparated from the body.

P. 156. "In other paſſages, where the "ſame word is by us rendered *ſoul*, there "would have been much more propriety in "tranſlating it *life*, which does not denote "a *ſubſtance*, but a *property*."

In

In many places, without doubt, the word *does* ſignify *life*; but I do not ſee how this can be any argument in favour of Dr. Prieſtley.

Ib. " Beſides, whatever principles we " may be led to aſcribe to man, from this " account of his formation in Gen. ii. 7. " the very ſame we ought to aſcribe to the " brutes, becauſe the very ſame words are " uſed both in the Hebrew and in the Sep- " tuagint, though they are differently ren- " dered in our tranſlation. For Gen. i. 24. " we read, *And God ſaid, Let the earth bring* " *forth the living creature* (נפש חיה) (*living* " *ſoul*): and again, Gen. ii. 19. *And what-* " *ſoever Adam called every living creature* " (*living ſoul*) *that was the name thereof.*" " For this obſervation," Dr. Prieſtley ſays, " he is indebted to an ingenious friend; and " he thinks it deciſive in the caſe."

Dr. Prieſtley and his friend here overlook what

what ſeems to me, a very important and eſſential article. It is true, the words נפש חיה in Gen. i. 24. and ii. 7. are the ſame. But, in the former text, which relates to the creation of brutes, the words are, *Let the* earth *bring forth* נפש חיה; in the latter text reſpecting men, the words are, God *breathed, &c. and man became* נפש חיה. Here there is a difference of circumſtance, which deſerves, I think, to be attended to. The texts, when compared together, ſeem to refer the *living principle* of man, and of brutes, to a different original, and ſhew it to be of a different nature, in the two caſes, though expreſſed by the ſame word.

There appears, therefore, to be nothing *deciſive* in this obſervation of Dr. Prieſtley, except, that the ſame word is ſometimes uſed to denote the *vital principle*, both in brutes, and in the human ſpecies. And this is no very remarkable circumſtance; nor is it peculiar to the Heb. language. For, in claſſical writers, the words, *anima*

and

and ψυχη, are used with the same latitude; as will appear, I think, from the following quotations.

Η τις ταλαινης της εμης ψυχης φονευς

Aut miseræ meæ *animæ* occisor.

Eurip. Herc. 432.

——— ινα της ψυχης ωκιστος ελεθρος.

——— Ubi *animæ* citissimum exitium.

Il. Lib. 22. 236.

——— αμφι δε καπροι

Δοιοι, απευραμενοι ψυχας.

——— circum autem apri,

Duo, spoliati vitâ.

Hesiod. Scut. Herc. 173.

——— Lucem que perosi

Projecere *animas*.

Æn. 6. 435.

——— *animasque* in vulnere ponunt.

Georg. 4. Lib. 237.

And

And these words are used for the *souls* of men, which are supposed to exist after the death of the body.

Πολλας δ' ιφθιμους ψυχας αϊδι προιαψεν
Ηρωων, αυτους δε ελωρια τευχε κυνεσσιν
Οιωνοισι τε πασι. Il. A. 2, 3, 4.

Di, quibus imperium est *animarum*, umbræque silentes. Æn. 6. 264.

P. 157. Dr. Priestley proceeds to the account which the Scriptures give of the *mortality* of man.

"Death is first threatened to man in "these terms, Gen. ii. 17. Of the tree of "knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt "not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest "thereof, thou shalt surely die. Here is "no exception made of any part of the "man that was not to die."

Here is no exception made, it is true; but there might be one, nevertheless. For,

 amongst

amongſt us, when perſons commit crimes worthy of capital puniſhments, the denunciation againſt them is generally in ſome ſuch words as theſe: *that they muſt die*, or, *be put to death*. There is not always an exception made of the *part*, which is not to die: and yet it is the commonly received opinion, that when the ſentence of death has been executed upon ſuch criminals, ſomething ſtill remains, when the *body* is deſtroyed. And Adam, for any thing which appears to the contrary, might have knowledge of this particular.

P. 159. "When the wickedneſs of men "was ſo great, that God was reſolved to de- "ſtroy them from the face of the earth by a "flood, he ſays, Gen. vi. 3. *My ſpirit ſhall* "*not always ſtrive with man, for that he alſo* "*is fleſh* (בשר). Here is no mention of "any other ſuperior principle."

Neither is there any mention of the *body*,

or

or the *inferior principle*, which Dr. Prieſtley here ſuppoſes, for the word בשר, here rendered *fleſh*, does not, in this paſſage, ſignify the *body*, or the *ſubſtance* of which man is, according to the Dr.'s opinion, ſolely compoſed; as will appear from the following conſiderations.

For if it does, if man conſiſt of one principle only, and the word בשר, here denote that principle, God will be repreſented as about to puniſh man for a circumſtance, which he could not poſſibly have avoided. "My ſpirit ſhall not always ſtrive with "man, *becauſe* he is *really fleſh* *" His being

* This, I apprehend, is the true rendering of הוא בשר בשגם; for the word בשגם, which I tranſlate, '*becauſe* '*really*,' is compounded of גם, *profecto, certe, etiam, quoque*, &c. and ש, which is a contraction of אשר, *quod*; and the prepoſition ב, which ſignifies *in, apud, propter*, &c.; and באשר, or בש, ſignifies *propter quod*, or *becauſe*. And גם, here muſt ſignify *certainly, really*, or *truly*; for it cannot properly be rendered *alſo*, becauſe, the tranſlation would then convey an improper idea of God. "My ſpirit ſhall

ing *flesh*, or *body*, if the word mean that, could be no crime; and therefore could not deserve punishment. But the word בשר, here plainly represents something criminal, which was the cause of God's withdrawing his spirit from mankind. It cannot therefore in this place signify the body *.

Besides; if it had this meaning, *Noah* and his family would have been included in the resolution here made by the Deity; and must, consequently, have been destroyed with the rest of the world: for *they* were *flesh* in the literal sense of the word, as well as the rest of mankind.

Nor

" not always strive with man, for that he *also* is *flesh*." Which seems to imply, that God himself is *flesh*, as well as man; a notion totally repugnant to the doctrine of Scripture. See Isaiah xxxi. 3. John iv. 24. Luke xxiv. 39.

* And therefore there was no reason to expect any mention of a superior principle in this place.

Nor can it denote the *frailty* of man, as it ſometimes does in Scripture (ſee Jerem. xvii. 5. 2 Chron. xxxii. 8, &c.) for then, the perſons ſpoken of, would have been objects of God's *mercy* and *forbearance*, not of his *anger*, and *indignation* *.

The word, in this paſſage, manifeſtly includes in it ſomething reprehenſible, ſomething wrong in the morals and affections †.

For

* As:

Yea, he oftentimes turned away his wrath,
And would not ſuffer his whole diſpleaſure to ariſe,
For, he remembered that they were but *fleſh* (בשר).
Pſalm lxxviii. 38, 39.

† Grotius gives the ſame interpretation of the latter part of the verſe, *Quia caro eſt*. "Carni paſcendæ et oblectandæ "ſtudet ſine Dei timore."

He derives the word דין, in the former part of the verſe, which is rendered to *ſtrive*, from נדן, vagina, and tranſlates it *permanebit*; conſidering the body of man as the *houſe*, or *ſheath* of the *ſoul*. This rendering agrees better with the Sept. and ſome of the other verſions; but, I am inclined to think, that the word is derived from דון, *dicere cauſam*; eſpecially, as the word נדן, ſeems to be Chaldee, and, I do not remember the verb derived from it to be ever uſed in

Hebrew.

For it is with respect to these only, that man is capable of contracting guilt, and becoming worthy of punishment. And it clearly appears from Scripture, that the world was destroyed by a flood on account of its great wickedness and degeneracy; that it was so *obstinately* given up to *fleshly* appetites and passions, that no hopes were left, of its ever growing better, had God been pleased to spare it longer, and to "strive with it by his spirit."

Hence it appears, that the silence in Gen. vi. 3. respecting a superior principle, is not the least objection to the doctrine of a *soul*. On the contrary, if any inference may be drawn, it is, that man has a higher, or superior principle; but that living, as if he had not, he is called *flesh* by way of reproach, for neglecting this better part, and living

Hebrew. The substantive is to be found in 1 Chron. xxi. 27. and in Dan. vii. 15. it is put for the *body*, in reference to the *spirit*, of which it is the receptacle.

living, as if he were deſtitute of any thing rational and ſpiritual.

However, if Dr. Prieſtley ſhould ſtill contend, becauſe "here is no mention of "any other ſuperior principle," that therefore there is no higher principle in man, he is referred to Iſaiah, ch. lvii. 16. a paſſage not exactly like this in queſtion; yet ſo far like it, as to ſhew the weakneſs of Dr. Prieſtley's inference.

I will not alway contend,
Neither for ever will I be wroth,
For the *ſpirit* (רוח) before me would be overwhelmed,
And the *living ſouls* (נשמות) which I have made.

Bp. Lowth's Verſion.

Here is no mention of any *inferior* principle; ſhall we therefore conclude that we have no *bodies?*

P. 160.

P. 160. "Particular mention is made of "the deaths of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Jo-"seph, Aaron, Moses, David, and many "others; but all that is said upon any of "these occasions, is, either that the dying "person *was gathered to his people*, or *that he* "*slept with his fathers*. Now, certainly *sleep* "does not give us the idea of a person's "being *alive* and *active*; and especially of "his entering upon a *new mode* of being, in "which he should be more *alive*, more "*active*, more *vigorous*, than he had ever "been before."

Whatsoever sense might be affixed to these phrases, used in the old Testament, of men being *gathered to their fathers*, &c. says a writer, well qualified to judge on these matters *, they seem to have arisen at first from an opinion, that the *souls* of the deceased repaired to certain mansions; that every nation and every family had their separate districts

* Dr. Jortin.

diſtricts in that great world of the dead, and that they who departed hence went to dwell with their own anceſtors *.

And that figurative deſcription in Iſaiah, ch. xiv. 9, &c. dreſſed in poetical ornaments, is built upon an hypotheſis, received in thoſe days, that the ſouls of men, ſeparated from the body, went to a vaſt ſubterraneous region, divided into various manſions, according to the diſpoſitions and qualities of the perſons, who were to inhabit them; that theſe Ghoſts ſtill retained the ſhadow and appearance of thoſe perſons, and of the character and ſtation in which they had acted upon earth †.

And with regard to thoſe expreſſions, in which

* Lucian, in the *Necyomantia*, feigning that he entered into the Acheruſian plain, ſays, there were found the Demi-gods, and the Heroines, and Multitudes of the dead, divided according to their nations and tribes. See Jortin's Sermons, Vol. VII. p. 310.

† See Vitringa on Iſaiah xiv. 9.

which the dead are deſcribed as *ſleeping*, and lying in a ſtate of *inſenſibility*, the ſame writer ſays, that the ſtate of the *ſoul*, as many learned men have juſtly obſerved, is out of the queſtion. Death is there conſidered purely in oppoſition to this life upon earth, and a body when the ſpirit hath left it, in oppoſition to a *living body*. A dead man, or his lifeleſs body, goes into the grave, into the *houſe* of *darkneſs*, *ſleep*, *ſilence*, *oblivion:* and can neither praiſe God, nor ſee the *ſun*, nor converſe with men, nor have any intercourſe with the world.

Thus Homer, who ſuppoſeth the *ſhades* of the dead to *live* and to *act* in Hades, ſometimes repreſents death, as a ſtate of *inſenſibility*.

This region of the dead, is called by the Hebrews שאול; by the Greeks ᾅδης; and by the Latins *inferi*; and in our tranſlation generally *hell*. The word שאול properly ſignifies the place or manſion of the

the dead, wherever they are. The present acceptation of the word *hell*, does not convey the true sense of the original word. For שאול does not *generally* mean a place of punishment; and some have doubted whether it *ever* does. But there are two passages, in which it seems to me undoubtedly to have this meaning, viz. Psal. ix. 17. Prov. xv. 11.

We are not, however, from hence to conclude, that the Jews had no notion, or belief of a place of punishment after death: for Mr. Mede *, in his discourse on Prov. xxi. 16. observes, that רפאים, was understood to denote the state of the wicked after death, before the valley of Hinnom was made an emblem, or representation of it. The authors of the Syriac version and the Vulg. understood the term to mean a place of punishment †.

Various

* See Dis. VII. pag. 32.

† See Syr. Ver. Prov. xxi. 16. and the Vulg. Job xxvi. 5.

Various are the interpretations, which the learned have given of this word רפאים. And the authors of the ſeveral verſions have rendered it differently. The Sept. have rendered it very differently in the ſame book †.

Sometimes it probably ſignifies the *manes*, or *ſpirits* of deceaſed perſons ‡.

P. 160. "In the account of the death "of Joſeph, it is ſaid, Gen. l. 26. they em- "balmed him, and he was put into a coffin "in Egypt. It is not ſaid, that there was "any part of him that was not embalmed, "and that could not be put into a coffin."

This objection ſeems almoſt too trifling to merit a ſerious reply. For what is more common, even amongſt thoſe who believe that man has a *ſoul* which ſurvives the diſ-

ſolution

† Vid. Sept. Iſaiah xiv. 9. and xxvi. 14, 19.

‡ See Dr. Durell on Job xxvi. 5.

ſolution of the body, than to call a man's *corps*, *himſelf*? We hear it ſaid every day, *ſuch* or *ſuch* a perſon died, was put into his *coffin* and *buried*. It very rarely happens on theſe occaſions, that any thing is ſaid concerning the *immaterial* or *immortal* principle.

P. 164, 165. "If we ſearch the Scrip-
"tures for paſſages more particularly ex-
"preſſive of the *ſtate of man at death*, we
"find in them not only no trace of *ſenſe*,
"*thought*, or *enjoyment*, but, on the contrary,
"ſuch declarations as expreſſly exclude it;
"as Pſal. vi. 5. *In death there is no remem-*
"*brance of thee. In the grave who ſhall give*
"*thee thanks?* Pſal. cxv. 17. *The dead praiſe*
"*not the Lord, neither all they that go down to*
"*ſilence.* Pſal. cxlvi. 5. *His breath goeth*
"*forth, he returneth to the earth, in that very*
"*day his thoughts periſh.*"

The laſt inſtance, which at the firſt ſight may

may appear to favour Dr. Prieſtley's hypotheſis, on examination will loſe its force. For the word עשתנות, here tranſlated *thoughts*, would have been rendered more properly, by ſome of theſe following words, *projects*, *deſigns*, *ſchemes* *. And this interpretation, not only agrees better with the context than the preſent verſion, but it appears to have been ſo underſtood by the Sept.† Syr. and Chald. verſions. And it may be doubted, whether the word in Heb. † ever ſignifies *thought*. In Chald. and Syr. it ſome-

* Gataker renders it *projects*. Id quod animo moliebatur; deducitur a verbo עשת quod in *Hithpael* eſt conſilium inire, vel dare operam. Clericus.

† Conſilia ipſius, the Latin tranſlation of the Syriac ܡܚܫܒܘܗܝ, which comes from ܚܫܒ, cogitavit, conſultavit, exiſtimavit, reputavit, &c. Targ. זמיונוי, machinationes ejus. Sept. πάντες οι διαλογισμοι αυτων.

Shultens renders it *ſplendida proſperitas*; and if it be derived from עשת, nitidum eſſe, it may ſignify outward pomp or ſplendor: and this ſenſe would agree very well with the context. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth "to the earth, in that very day all his *pomp*, or *grandeur*, "periſhes." See Shultens on Job xii. 5. and Guſſetius's Lexicon, and J. D. Michaelis in loc.

ſometimes has this ſignification. (It occurs Jon. i. 6. and probably ſignifies *to be favourable to* *. Cant. v. 14. Jerem. v. 28. Ezek. xxvii. 19. and Job xii. 5.)

But there are paſſages in Scripture, which imply that men are not without *ſenſe*, *thought*, or *enjoyment at death*. Prov. xiv. 32. *The wicked is driven away in his wickedneſs; but the righteous hath* hope *in his death* (במתו), the ſame expreſſion as in Pſal. vi. 5. *What is the* hope (תקוה) *of the hypocrite, though he hath gained, when God taketh away his* ſoul? Job xxvii. 8. *When a wicked man dieth, his* expectation, *or* hope (תקוה) *periſheth, and the* hope *of unjuſt men periſheth*. Prov. xi. 7.

Now

* Exponere licet Jonæ i. 6. forſan ſerenum ſe, amænum, placidum reddet nobis, vultu nitido ſeſe exhibebit. Guſſetius' Lexicon.

The Biſhop of Waterford, however, in his attempt towards an improved verſion of the minor Prophets, I find, renders it 'to *think*;' and if ever it has this ſenſe in Heb. it is probably in this place.

Now these texts evidently imply, that they who are sincere and upright, have *hope* when God taketh away their souls.

It may probably be objected, that *hope* in these passages, refers to the resurrection only, and not to an intermediate state; but this objection, since it can be founded only on conjecture, or opinion, will deserve attention no farther than it can be supported by satisfactory arguments. However, by the same liberty of interpretation, the two texts above cited by Dr. Priestley, viz. Psal. vi. 5. and cxv. 17. which speak of the state of death, as a state of *forgetfulness*, &c. may be referred to *this life*, and not to the condition of persons in the grave.

The expressions, "*In death there is no remembrance of thee, &c.*" "*The dead praise not the Lord, &c.*" may mean only, that they who are in the *grave*, cannot join the *living*, in such praises and thanksgiving, as

are

are celebrated *on earth*: there, certainly, is no greater liberty taken in this mode of interpretation, than in referring the word *hope* in death to the resurrection *.

But there are passages similar to these above mentioned, in which the *present life* seems plainly to be referred to. For in Eccles. ix. 5. where it is expressly said, that "*the dead know not any thing*," strong as the expression may be, a state of *insensibility* is not implied, as will appear from considering the whole passage together.

"*The dead know not any thing* †;" and then

* Necessario dicendum est hæc verba de functorum statu non esse accipienda *absolutè*, sed *relativè*, cum respectu ad laudationem et celebrationem Dei veritatisque ejus in implendis promissis gratiæ quæ obtinet in cœtibus sanctorum in *hisce terris*. Vitringa on Isa. xxxviii. 18. "For the grave "cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that "go down to the pit cannot hope for thy truth."

† Non sciunt quidquid eorum quæ in hoc seculo aguntur. See Michaelis in loc.

then the ſacred writer immediately ſubjoins, "*neither have they any more a* re-
" ward."

Now, if this laſt ſentence do not refer to this world, it muſt imply that after death, there will be no ſtate of retribution; and if ſo, it contains a proof that there will be no *reſurrection.*

But, if we read what follows, and obſerve the connection, we ſhall perceive that the *whole* refers to *this life.* "*For the memory of*
" *them is forgotten; alſo their love, and their*
" *hatred, and their envy is now periſhed; nei-*
" *ther have they any more any portion in any*
" *thing that is done* under the ſun."

P. 166. "Solomon evidently conſiders
" the whole of man as equally mortal with
" brutes. After having ſaid, Eccleſ. iii. 17.
" *God ſhall judge the righteous and the wicked,*
" *for there is a time there for every purpoſe, and*

" *for*

"*for every work*; he adds, v. 18. *I ſaid in my* "*heart concerning the eſtate of the ſons of men,* "*that God might manifeſt them, and that they* "*might ſee that they themſelves are beaſts.* "*For that which befalleth the ſons of men,* "*befalleth beaſts; even one thing befalleth* "*them. As the one dieth, ſo dieth the other:* "*yea, they have all one breath. So that a* "*man hath no pre-eminence over a beaſt; for* "*all is vanity: all go to one place; all are of* "*the duſt, and all return to the duſt again.*"

Theſe words, "*all go to one place,*" may be ſpoken of the *body* only. "Omnes in "unum locum eunt, in pulverem nempe, "ut poſtea dicit, quod tamen non adfirmat "Salomo, niſi de *corpore:* ut ex ſequenti "verſu adparet *."

But

* Clericus in loc. whoſe authority, I ſhall the more frequently produce, becauſe he had no prejudices in favour of the doctrine, which is here attempted to be ſupported.

But admitting the *whole* of man to be here considered as equally mortal with brutes, it by no means follows, that Solomon's opinion concerning this matter is here expressed; but rather the contrary; as he appears, in some other parts of this book, to have considered the soul as something distinct from the body.

There are many things delivered in the book of Ecclesiastes, which make it necessary to suppose different speakers: such, perhaps, are these.

Chap. viii. 15. *I commended* mirth; *because a man has no better thing under the sun than to eat, and to drink, and to be merry.* Chap. ix. ver. 7, 8. *Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; let thy garments be always white, let thy head lack no ointment.*

And, in the following passages in the same

ſame book, chap. ii. 2. *I ſaid of laughter, it is* mad, *and of* mirth, *whath doth it?* Chap. vii. 3. *Sorrow is better than laughter; for by the ſadneſs of the countenance the heart is made better. The heart of the wiſe is in the houſe of mourning; but the heart of fools is in the houſe of mirth. It is better to go to the houſe of mourning, than to the houſe of feaſting.*

Sentiments, or maxims ſo oppoſite as theſe, cannot be ſuppoſed to proceed from the ſame author, as his own. There ſeems therefore to be a neceſſity in ſome places, either for admitting of different ſpeakers, or ſuppoſing that Solomon himſelf perſonates different characters *. And, if the paſſage above cited be conſidered, as put into the mouth of one who objects to religion, or, as

* La grande difficulté du livre de l' Eccleſiaſtes vient de la grande varieté des perſonnages qui y ſont introduits, et dont chacun propoſe des maximes conformes a ſes principes. Ceux qui ont entrepris l' explication du livre de l' Eccleſiaſtes n' ont peut-être toujours aſſez remarqué cette diverſité. Saurin. Tom. IX.

as an objection which had occurred to the writer himſelf, as ſome judicious commentators have thought *, it would be more agreeable to the ſtyle and method of this book.

I would alſo conſider the verſe which follows, as ſpoken by the ſame objector. "*Who knoweth the ſpirit of man that goeth up-*
"*ward, and the ſpirit of a beaſt that goeth*
"*downward to the earth?*

For this queſtion appears to me to be aſked by the ſame perſon, in order to obviate an objection which he was aware might be made to what he had aſſerted in the foregoing verſes; and, perhaps, it might be aſked with an air of triumph, and not without ſome mixture of ridicule.

As if he had ſaid, I am ſenſible that it is the

* See Dr. Taylor.

the *vulgularly received opinion* *, that man has ſome pre-eminence, or ſuperiority over a

* That it was the *vulgarly received opinion* amongſt the Jews, that the ſoul ſurvives the body, appears from 1 Sam. xxviii. 11. where Saul applies to the witch of Endor to raiſe Samuel from the dead. " Fac ut mihi aſcendat (*Samuel*) ergo credebat Samuelem ſubductum quidem eſſe oculis hominum, *corpore* ejus mortuo; ſed meliore ſui parte, hoc eſt animo, etiamnum vivere et quidem in loco quodam ſub terra, unde aſcendere eum optabat, ut interroganti reſponderet." Clericus.

" Wherever there was an opinion of the evocation of the dead, there muſt have been as the foundation of it, a general perſuaſion that the ſoul ſurvived the body." Dr. Jortin.

And Le Clerc himſelf allows, that from this paſſage in Sam. it appears, that *Saul* believed that the *ſoul* of Samuel was ſtill in being. 1 Sam. xxviii. 7. Ex hac hiſtoria manifeſtum fit Hebræos *vulgo* credidiſſe poſt corporum mortem animos hominum ſupereſſe; neque enim potuit *Saul* optare ſibi evocari *animum* Samuelis, niſi ſuperſtitem eum eſſe crederet. Idem colligere licet ex loco Moſis, ubi vetat conſuli *mortuos*, ut Deut. xviii. 10.

" From this circumſtance, thus much may undoubtedly be concluded, that Saul, though he was no religious prince, believed the continuance of the ſoul after death, and that conſequently it was the common opinion in his time." Dr. Jortin.

See Joſep. alſo, lib. 6. c. 15. τῆς δὲ Σαμουήλου ψυχῆς συνθομένης, &c. which ſhews, that he uſed ψυχη for the *ſoul* in this place.

a beaſt, viz. that at *death*, the ſpirit of man goeth upwards, and returns to God, and the ſpirit of a beaſt goeth downwards to the earth. But who is certain of this? who knows it ſo as to be able to prove or demonſtrate it?

This appears to me to be the meaning of this paſſage: how far it is right is ſubmitted to the judgment of the learned.

But it ſeems the more probable that this interpretation is the true one, as the particle כי, *for*, is found in ſome MSS. at the beginning of the verſe, which is a preſumption that it might be the original reading. If it be taken into the text again, it will confine the 21ſt verſe to the ſame ſpeaker, and ſupport the above conjecture.

I ſhall now give Dr. Prieſtley's obſervations on this text.

He

He ſees no appearance that either this, or the verſes preceding, come from an objector, or a different ſpeaker. And, in order to make them conſiſtent with what goes before, he ſays, that the expreſſions of the ſpirit of man going *upward*, and that of a beaſt *downward*, can only mean, that notwithſtanding the difference in the *form* and *poſture* of a man and a beaſt, in conſequence of which, the breath of man goes *upwards*, and that of a beaſt *downwards*, there is no difference between them when they die.

Surely Dr. Prieſtley has here forgotten himſelf a little. I had always underſtood that it was the property of *all* vapour to aſcend, and conſequently, that the breath of a *beaſt* goes *upward*, as well as the breath of a *man*.

It appears, indeed, afterwards, as if he was not altogether ſatisfied with this interpretation; for he ſays, *upwards*, and *down-*

 wards,

wards, in this place, may not relate to the *breath*, nor any thing represented by the *breath*, but *to the posture of the body in walking*, man walking with his head upwards, and the beast with his head downwards.

Such fanciful and vague interpretations as these, carry their own confutation along with them.

P. 168. "This writer indeed (i. e. So-
"lomon) speaking of death, uses this ex-
"pression, Eccles. xii. 7. *Then shall the dust*
"*return to the earth as it was, and the spirit*
"*shall return unto God who gave it.* But,
"as it is contrary to the whole tenor of
"of the Scriptures, to suppose that the souls
"of departed men are in heaven *with God*
"*and Christ*, where they are said not to be
"till after the resurrection, the meaning
"of this passage can only be, that God who
"gave *life*, will take it away."

How

How does it appear to be contrary to the whole tenor of the Scriptures to ſuppoſe, &c.? Does not St. Paul ſuppoſe it, when he ſays, Phil. chap. i. ver. 23. *I am in a ſtrait betwixt two, having a deſire to depart; and to be with Chriſt, which is far better.*

Theſe words plainly imply, I think, that he conſiders his *being with Chriſt*, as the immediate conſequence of his death: otherwiſe, there ſeems to have been no neceſſity to oppoſe "*being with Chriſt*," to "*living in the fleſh*." For, on the ſuppoſition, that he was not to be with Chriſt, till after the reſurrection, but remain in a ſtate of *inſenſibility*, there was no occaſion to mention at all *being with Chriſt*; for he would not on this ſuppoſition be a moment ſooner *with* him, by *dying*, than by *living*. And the common people (for they are not generally metaphyſicians) would naturally take the words in their *plain, literal* ſenſe: and therefore, if there be no intermediate ſtate,

St. Paul muſt have knowingly led them into an erroneous opinion. For even in this enlightened age, the words require ſome metaphyſical qualifications, before they are capable of totally excluding the idea of a ſeparate exiſtence. And as it was, at that time, and had been long before (as I have already proved *) the commonly received opinion, both amongſt the Jews and Greeks, that the ſouls of departed men, did exiſt in a ſeparate ſtate †: if this opinion had been erro-

* See page 39 of theſe remarks.

† "The *ſouls* (ψυχαι) of the juſt are in the hands of "God, and no puniſhment ſhall touch them: in the eyes of "the *fooliſh*, they *ſeem to die*; and their departure is eſteemed "evil; but they are in peace." Wiſd. chap. iii. 1, 2, 3.

Ancient Pagan authors aſſure us, that the Jews believed the immortality of the ſoul. See Grotius on Matt. v. 20.

And the following paſſages from Joſeph. are ſufficient proofs of it.—Τα μιν γε σωματα θνητα πασι και εκ φθαρτης υλης δημιουργειται. ψυχη δε αθανατος αει και θειν μοιρα τοις σωμασιν ενοικιζεται. Bell. Jud. Lib. III. 25.

Αθανατον τε ισχυν ταις ψυχαις παρεχεις αυτοις ειναι και υπο χθονος δικαιωσεις τε και τιμας, &c. Antiq. Lib. XVIII. Chap. I.

erroneous, it does not ſeem conſiſtent with the character of this apoſtle to expreſs himſelf in terms, which muſt neceſſarily increaſe this error.

Our Saviour's words to the thief on the croſs *, *Verily I ſay unto thee, To-day thou ſhalt be with me in paradiſe*, appear to me to afford a *deciſive proof* of a ſeparate exiſtence; for as to the different punctuation adopted by ſome of the adverſaries of this doctrine, it is eſteemed by all good critics, as altogether trifling and inſupportable. Grotius notes it as a very bad interpretation; and "there is a difficulty," ſays the learned Dr. Townſon, "attending it, which has not yet "been ſurmounted, of giving the words any "tolerable force, and making the ſenſe bet-"ter *with* it, than if it was *away*. Beſides "which, St. Luke is made to expreſs him-"ſelf in a matter of moment with an am-"biguity, which he could eaſily have avoid-"ed,

* Luke xxiii. 43.

" ed, by inſerting the particle οτι, which is " no more improper after λεγω in Greek, " than *that* is, after *I ſay*, in Engliſh."

There are many other paſſages in the New Teſtament, were it neceſſary now to produce them, which inculcate the ſame doctrine; but, as it was my intention to confine myſelf chiefly to the Old Teſtament, I ſhall proceed to examine the ſingular interpretation, which Dr. Prieſtley has given of Eccleſ. xii. 7.

Having aſſerted, as we have ſeen above, that " it is contrary to the whole tenor of " Scripture to ſuppoſe that the ſouls of de- " parted men are in heaven with God and " Chriſt till after the reſurrection, the " meaning of this paſſage," he adds, " can " only be, that God, who gave *life*, will " take it away: the word *ſpirit* denoting " nothing more than *breath* or *life*."

The

The intelligent reader will immediately perceive, that this is a very concise method of evading the force of this text, which makes so expressly for the soul's being a principle in man distinct from the body.

The word רוח, *spirit*, it is well known, frequently signifies *breath*; but there are few passages, where it evidently signifies *life*; yet Dr. Priestley, in his interpretation of the text under consideration, has adopted this meaning without any sort of hesitation, and even without producing one instance, where it has this *signification*. But it is a sufficient objection to the word's having this signification here, if there was no other, that the latter part of the sentence will convey no intelligible meaning, if we substitute *life* for *spirit* in the translation.

"*Then shall the dust return to the earth as* "*it was, and the* life *shall return unto God* "*who gave it.*" When the dust is returned

to

to the earth, there can certainly be no *life* remaining to return to any place; the *life* is absolutely taken away, and destroyed with the body. The word רוח cannot therefore in this place signify *life*; nor can life, with any propriety of speech, be said to return to God, being only a property; and there is not, I imagine, any phrase in Scripture to support, or favour such an interpretation. For with respect to the passage which Dr. Priestley has produced out of the New Testament, and compared with this, "By "the same kind of figure *our lives* are said, "(Col. iii. 3.) after death to *be hid with* "*Christ in God.*" There is nothing in it which bears the least resemblance to that in Eccles. For, first, in Eccles. xii. 7. there does not appear to be *any* figure of speech made use of; but only a plain account of what happens at death: therefore it cannot possibly be "*said by the* same kind *of figure.*"

Besides, the *subject* of these two texts is entirely

entirely different. In Eccles. *natural death* is spoken of, the dissolution of the body. In Col. *death unto sin*, and to the vanities of the world. In the former, we have a plain description of what happens to the *whole man, body and soul*, when he dies, or departs out of the world.

"*Then shall the dust, &c.*"

In the latter, we have a *figurative description* of what happened to the *dispositions* and *tempers only* of the Colossians, when they embraced the Gospel, when they departed from a state of sin to a state of holiness. "*If ye be risen with Christ, seek those* "*things which are above, &c. for ye are dead,* "*and your life is hid with Christ in God, &c.* "*mortify therefore your members which are on* "*the earth, &c. &c.*"

We have not a word in Colossians concerning the *natural death of the body*, and,

the Coloſſians probably lived ſome time after St. Paul wrote his epiſtle to them; and therefore, they *ſtill* had to die a *natural death*; this circumſtance, Eccleſ. xii. 7. was *ſtill* to happen to them: "*Their duſt was to return* "*to the earth as it was; and their ſpirit was* "*to return to God, who gave it.*" But, if the word rendered *ſpirit*, ſignify *life*, the ſame as ζωη in Coloſſians, and, if the figure be of the *ſame kind*; though the *life* of the Coloſſians, as we have ſeen, was already *hid with Chriſt, before* they *died* *; yet, on this ſuppoſition, it muſt be obliged to return to him again, i. e. it muſt return to God, when he had it already.

St. Stephen affords us an inſtance, which may illuſtrate the above obſervation. He was dead as much as any perſon could be, in the ſenſe that the Coloſſians were, and *his*

* And not, *after death*, as Dr. Prieſtley aſſerts, as is evident from theſe words, "*mortify your members therefore which* "*are upon the earth, &c.*"

his life was juſt as much (if not more) *hid with Chriſt*, as their's; and yet, when he is going to die, or depart out of this world; he prays that Chriſt would receive his *ſpirit* (πνευμα), i. e. his *life*, according to Dr. Prieſtley, which was already hid with Chriſt.

Hence it ſufficiently appears, I apprehend, *both* that the words in Coloſſians are not ſpoken by *the ſame kind of figure*, and that the word רוח, tranſlated *ſpirit*, cannot here ſignify *life*; and conſequently, that theſe words, "*the ſpirit ſhall return unto God*, "*who gave it*," cannot mean merely, that "God, who gave *life*, will take it away."

I ſhall now endeavour to ſhew what the real meaning of the paſſage appears to be.

If we examine it, we ſhall perceive that it is divided into two diſtinct propoſitions, which convey two diſtinct ideas; for it

cannot be one of those passages, frequent in the poetical books of Scripture; where the latter proposition corresponds to the former, i. e. expresses the same sense, in different, but equivalent terms *; unless the word רוח (spirit) and עפר (dust) be equivalent terms; and "*returning to God, who gave* "*it*," and "*returning to the earth as it was*," be phrases or expressions of similar import.

But the word רוח is almost as different from עפר, in its signification, as it is possible. And there is not a passage, I believe, in the whole Scripture, where the word translated *spirit*, can be proved to signify any

* Such as,
"Blessed is the man that feareth God,
That greatly delighteth in his commandments."
Psal. cxii. 1.

"Incline your ear, and come unto me,
Hearken, and your soul shall live."
Isaiah lv. 3.

any part of the *human body* †. The latter clauſe

† It is ſuppoſed by ſome to have the ſame meaning as לב (heart) in Pſal. li. 17. and, in ſome other places, נשבר לב, '*a broken heart*;' רוח נשברה, '*a broken ſpirit*:' but it ſhould be remembered, that לב, is, in ſuch paſſages, taken in a figurative ſenſe for the *temper*, or *diſpoſition*. And therefore, though רוח ſhould appear to have the ſame meaning, it does not, on that account, ſignify any part of the human body; nor any thing *corporeal*.

The following, I believe, are all the different ſenſes, which it has in the Old Teſtament. It ſignifies, *breath*, *air*, *wind*, *temper*, *mind*, *courage*, and perhaps, Gen. xxxii. 16. *open ſpace*, and, ſometimes, *vigour*. Job xii. 10. and Pſal. xxxi. 5. it may ſignify *life*. — Gen. vi. 3. Job xxxiii. 4. 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. Iſai. lxiii. 10. Joel iii. 1. &c. &c. it ſignifies *the ſpirit of God*.

In the New Teſtament, God is called a *ſpirit* (πνευμα), which is the correſponding word in Greek. In ſeveral places רוח, is oppoſed to בשר, *fleſh*, as Iſa. xxxi. 3. ſpeaking of the Egyptians, he ſays, "*Their horſes are* בשר, *not* רוח." 1 Cor. v. 5. "*To deliver ſuch an one to ſatan for the* "*deſtruction of the fleſh, that the* ſpirit (πνευμα) *may be ſaved* "*in the day of the Lord Jeſus.*" vii. 34. To be holy in *body* and *ſpirit* (και σωματι και πνευματι). And in the following paſſages, it appears to denote *intelligences*, or *ſpirits* without *bodies*; at leaſt, without ſuch *bodies*, as we have at preſent. 1 Kin. xxii. 21. There came forth a *ſpirit*. Job iv, 15. Then a *ſpirit* paſſed before my face, &c. and 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 15, 16. Chap. xxiii. 18. 10. with רעה, an evil *ſpirit*.

clauſe of the verſe, does not therefore correſpond to the former, in ſenſe.

Suppoſing it to have any thing of the nature of parallelism, it would approach neareſt to the *antithetic* kind, where every word in the *preceding*, hath frequently its oppoſite, in the *latter part* of the ſentence *. As,

A *wiſe ſon* maketh a *glad father*.
But a *fooliſh ſon* is the *grief* of his *mother*.
Prov. x. 1.

This ſort of parallelism abounds in the book of Proverbs, compoſed by the author of the book of Eccleſiaſtes: and it appears to

rit. In the New Teſtament, Acts xxiii. 9. uſed, as ſynonimous to *angel*, "An angel, or ſpirit." Heb. i. 14. Angels called miniſtering *ſpirits*. Heb xii. 9. God is called the "father of *ſpirits*," ſimilar to Num. xvi. 22. and chap. xxvii. 16.—In all the different meanings, above mentioned, it does not appear to denote *any part* of the *human body*.

* See Bp. Lowth's Prelim. Diſſertation to his Iſaiah, and alſo Prælection 19.

to have been contrived for the purpose of conveying instruction in a more engaging, and striking manner *.

But though in Eccles. xii. 7. there appears to be an opposition in the several parts of the verse, yet this arises naturally from the subject, and not from any art or contrivance in the writer. For the words do not contain any thing which partakes of the nature of the משל, or proverb †, but are simply narrative.

"*Then shall the dust return to the earth as it*
"*was:*

* Equidem totum hoc genus potissimum convenit adagiis et dictis acutis; adeoque in parabolis Salomonis præcipue cernitur, quarum vis omnis et elegantia sæpenumero vertitur *in hac partium contrapositione.* See Lowth, De Sacra Poesi Prælect. 19. See also Dr. Hunt's Dissertations on some select Passages out of the Book of Proverbs.

† Verbi משל si *vim* atque usum investigemus, ea invenemus Tria potissimum significari; *sententiosum*, *figuratum*, et *sublime* dicendi genus. Prælect. 4. p. 47. 8vo.

"*was: and the ſpirit ſhall return unto God,*
"*who gave it.*"

Now, the very manner, in which theſe words run, convey to us, in as clear terms as poſſible, the idea of two diſtinct principles: for, firſt, we have mention made of what we know happens to the *body* on its diſunion; and then after the *body*, or the duſt (עפר) is repreſented, as returned to the earth, we have ſomething ſpoken of, as ſtill remaining, which is expreſſly ſaid to return * to a *different place*, to God †, who gave it ‡.

If

* Patet hinc, animam *ſubſtantiam* eſſe, non *merum halitum*, quia dicitur *redire ad Deum*, quod de *accidente* dici non poteſt.

† Ad *Deum*, tanquam judicem, ut ab eo aſſignetur ipſi ſedes conveniens vel in cœlo, vel apud inferos. Vid. Michaelis in loc.

‡ "נתנה," "gave it," is oppoſed to כשהיה," "as it was." It is certain, God gave both the body and the *ſoul* or *ſpirit* but this ſhews, that the *ſpirit* was given in a ſenſe totally different from that, wherein the *body* was given."

See Bp. Browne's Proced. of the Human Underſtanding, p. 356.

If theſe words do not ſpeak of the ſoul as ſomething diſtinct, and exiſting ſeparate from the body, it will be difficult to find words capable of expreſſing this idea.

CONCLUSION.

The Remarks contained in the preceding pages, have ſhewn, I hope, to the ſatisfaction of the reader, that the notion of the *ſoul* being a ſubſtance, or principle, diſtinct from the *body*, has a much better foundation in the Scriptures, even in thoſe of the Old Teſtament, than Dr. Prieſtley is willing to allow.

It has been proved particularly, that the words נפש and רוח, do plainly, in holy Writ, denote ſuch a principle; and, that the word ψυχη, which correſponds to נפש, is

 uſed,

used, both by Josephus and the Septuagint writers, in the same meaning *.

I do not, however, pretend to determine what the *nature*, or *essence* of the substance is, which is signified either by נפש or רוח; for the Sacred Writers have not determined it. "*Scriptura* non curiosè de *animæ*, quâ raticcinamur, *naturâ* differit; nisi quòd in homine *corpus* et *spiritum* (quem opponit carni) distinguit, et eam partem meliorem, vocat כבודו, gloriam ejus †."

What I have undertaken to shew is, that the texts produced by Dr. Priestley to prove *that the soul is not a distinct principle*, do *not prove*

* And it may here be observed, that whenever the word נפש is opposed to בשר, it denotes the *soul* properly so called, or a distinct principle, or substance.

Isaiah x. 18. מנפש ועד בשר. In our translation, "both *soul* and *body*;" *literally*, "from the *soul* to the *flesh*." Bp. Lowth says, this is a proverbial expression like ours, *soul* and *body*.

† Vid. Cocceius' Lexicon in verb. נפש.

prove it; but, ſome of them, prove the direct contrary.

I have not thought it neceſſary to examine every one of thoſe texts, but only ſuch of them, as ſeemed moſt material to the point in queſtion: and I have confined myſelf almoſt entirely to the *Old Teſtament*, to which the courſe of my ſtudies has, of late, more particularly led my attention.

The paſſages that might be adduced from the *New Teſtament*, are ſtill more cogent and more deciſive againſt Dr. Prieſtley's opinion *. But they are in general ſo clear and

* There is one text in particular, which is *inſtar omnium*, and contains, in itſelf alone, an effectual confutation of Dr. Prieſtley's doctrine.

It is Matth. x. 28.—*Fear not them, which kill the* body, *but are not able to kill the* ſoul: *but rather fear him, which is able to deſtroy both* body *and* ſoul *in hell.*

Here the two component parts of man, the *ſoul* and *body*, are in ſo preciſe and pointed a manner diſtinguiſhed from each

and obvious, and have been ſo frequently cited and enlarged upon by much abler Writers, that they ſeem not to require from me any further illuſtration.

each other, that Dr. Prieſtley, with all his ingenuity and acuteneſs, has not been able to explain away, in the ſmalleſt degree, the force of this remarkable paſſage.

ERRATUM.

Page 16. for ολιθρος, read ολιθρος.